# Exhibit A

1 2 3 4 5 6	PROSKAUER ROSE LLP Elise M. Bloom (pro hac vice) Howard L. Ganz Neil H. Abramson (pro hac vice) Adam M. Lupion (pro hac vice) 11 Times Square New York, NY 10036 Telephone: (212) 969-3000 Facsimile: (212) 969-2900  PROSKAUER ROSE LLP Laura Reathaford (SBN 254751)	
7	lreathaford@proskauer.com 2049 Century Park East, 32nd Floor	
8	Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206 Telephone: 310.557.2900	
9	Facsimile: 310.557.2193	
10	Attorneys for Defendant	
11	HNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
12		ORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
13	AARON SENNE, et al., Individually and on	CASE NO. 3:14-cv-00608-RS
14	Behalf of All Those Similarly Situated;	
15	Plaintiffs,	CLASS ACTION
16	vs.	DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.,'S
17	OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF BASEBALL, an unincorporated association	SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO
18	doing business as MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL; et al.;	PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL
19 20	Defendants.	JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL
21		JURISDICTION AND VENUE
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERR	LL CLUB, INC.,'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS OGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as well as Local Civil Rule 33 of the Northern District of California, Defendant Atlanta National League Baseball Club, Inc. ("Defendant"), by and through its attorneys, Proskauer Rose LLP, hereby supplements its objections and answers to "Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories to Certain Franchise Defendants regarding Personal Jurisdiction and Venue" (the "Interrogatories"), as follows:

These objections and answers reflect Defendant's present knowledge of the matters covered by the Interrogatories and its best efforts to identify the information responsive to those Interrogatories. Defendant's efforts are continuing, however, and it reserves the right to amend and/or supplement the objections and answers herein as may be necessary or appropriate.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS** 

Each of Defendant's objections and answers is subject to and incorporates the General Objections made in its initial Objections and Answers to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories to Certain Franchise Defendants regarding Personal Jurisdiction and Venue.

The following General Objections apply to the Interrogatories, which shall have the same force and effect as if they were fully set forth in response to each individually numbered Interrogatory:

1. Defendant objects to the Interrogatories, including the "Definitions" and "Instructions" sections contained in the Interrogatories, to the extent they seek to impose obligations on Defendant that are in addition to, or inconsistent with, those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (the "Federal Rules"), the Local Civil Rules for the Northern District of California (the "Local Civil Rules"), the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders.

Defendant will apply the definitions and instructions established in Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules and Local Civil Rule 33 and will answer the Interrogatories in accordance with those Rules and will not provide information insofar as such production exceeds the requirements of those Rules.

5

- 6 7
- 9 10

- 11 12
- 13
- 14
- 15 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 25
- 26 27

- 2. Defendant objects to the "Definitions" section contained in the Interrogatories to the extent they are overbroad, beyond the scope of permissible discovery and/or seek information without proper limitation as to the scope of the limited discovery concerning the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue.
- 3. Defendant objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they are vague and/or ambiguous, fail to identify the information sought with reasonable particularity, are overbroad, irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and unduly burdensome.
- 4. Defendant objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they impermissibly infringe upon the privacy rights of third parties.
- 5. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Communications" in Paragraph 1 of the Definition section of the Interrogatories on the grounds that it is overbroad, seeks information not relevant to the subject matter of this action and goes beyond the scope of the limited discovery that Plaintiffs requested by motion and letter-brief in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue, and to the extent it seeks to impose obligations on Defendant that are in addition to, or inconsistent with, those imposed by the Federal Rules, Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders.
- 6. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' definitions of "Identify" in Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Definition section of the Interrogatories (and the Interrogatories applying the definition) on the grounds that they are overbroad, unduly burdensome, impermissibly infringe upon privacy rights of third parties to the extent it calls for information like residential addresses, seek information not relevant to the subject matter of this action and go beyond the scope of the limited discovery that Plaintiffs requested by motion and letter-brief in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue, and to the extent they seek to impose obligations on Defendant that are in addition to, or inconsistent with, those imposed by the Federal Rules, the Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

- 7. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "Person" in Paragraph 6 of the Definition section of the Interrogatories (and the Interrogatories applying the definition) on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, seeks information not relevant to the subject matter of this action and goes beyond the scope of the limited discovery that Plaintiffs requested by motion and letter-brief in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue, and to the extent it seeks to impose obligations on Defendant that are in addition to, or inconsistent with, those imposed by the Federal Rules, the Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders.
- 8. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' definition of "You" or "Your" in Paragraph 7 of the Definition section of the Interrogatories and as revised (and the Interrogatories applying the definition) on the grounds it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, unduly burdensome, impermissibly infringes upon privacy rights of third parties, seeks information not relevant to the subject matter of this action and goes beyond the scope of the limited discovery that Plaintiffs requested by motion and letter-brief in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue, and to the extent it seeks to impose obligations on Defendant that are in addition to, or inconsistent with, those imposed by the Federal Rules, the Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders. Defendant also objects to the extent it seeks information without proper limitation as to temporal scope.
- 9. For purposes of Defendant's Objections and Answers to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories to Certain Franchise Defendants Regarding Personal Jurisdiction and Venue, Defendant applies the following definition: "You" or "Your" shall mean the Major League Baseball Club and/or the Club's minor league affiliate(s).
- 10. Defendant objects to Paragraphs 1 through 3 of the Instructions section of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek to impose obligations on Defendant that are in addition to, or inconsistent with, those imposed by the Federal Rules, the Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders.

27

4

6

11

12 13

15 16

14

18 19

17

20

21

22

23 24

25

- 11. Defendant objects to Paragraph 4 of the Instructions section of the Interrogatories to the extent it seeks information without proper limitation as to temporal scope.
- 12. Defendant objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they presume the existence of certain facts, or are based on assumptions, neither proven by Plaintiffs, nor admitted by Defendant's willingness to answer any Interrogatory does not constitute in any manner Defendant's admission to any of the assertions set forth or assumed in the Interrogatories or constitute a waiver of Defendant's objections thereto.
- 13. Defendant objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information created after the commencement of the instant lawsuit or for the purposes of, or in connection with, the instant litigation.
- 14. Defendant objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they call for the production of (i) confidential or proprietary business information relating to Defendant and/or (ii) confidential or proprietary information concerning individuals or entities who are not parties to this action ("third parties"). To the extent Defendant agrees to provide confidential or proprietary information, such production shall be subject to an appropriate Stipulated Protective Order to be executed by the parties.
- 15. Defendant reserves its right to supplement their Interrogatory answers in the event it discovers further information responsive to the Interrogatories, and also reserves its right to amend and/or supplement any answer or objection herein.
- 16. In providing these objections and answers to the Interrogatories, Defendant does not waive or intend to waive, but, on the contrary, reserves and intends to reserve:
  - a. all questions as to competency, authenticity, relevancy, materiality, privilege, and admissibility of the information provided hereunder or the subject matter thereof;
  - b. the right to object on any ground to the use of the information provided hereunder or the subject matter thereof at any trial or hearing in this matter or in any related or subsequent action or proceeding;

the right to object on any ground at any time to a demand for further information or document production; and

3

d. the right at any time to revise, supplement, correct, or add to its answers.

To the extent that any information is provided in answer to an Interrogatory,

4 5 17.

General Objections.

Defendant will provide the responsive information once. Additionally, to the extent that Defendant references its answers or responses to other Interrogatories and/or Document Requests,

7

6

Defendant's objections to the other Interrogatories and/or Document Requests are incorporated herein by reference.

8

10

11

18. These General Objections shall be deemed continuing throughout and incorporated into each and every one of the following specific objections and answers to the Interrogatories, whether or not expressly repeated in an answer to any particular Definition, Instruction or Interrogatory, unless otherwise noted. The statement of any specific objection in the following answers to the Interrogatories shall in no way waive or prejudice Defendant's assertion of the

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

19. Defendant's objections and answers to the Interrogatories are without waiver of, or prejudice to, its right to later use additional documents or information not set forth or referred to in these answers to the Interrogatories. Any answer contained herein is also made with the express reservation of all rights pursuant to the Federal Rules, Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders to supplement or amend these answers or to present evidence either discovered subsequent to the date hereof or the significance of which is later discovered.

21

22

#### SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS

#### 23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1**

Identify each address at which you maintained an office or place of business or owned or leased property in California that is used in Your business.

26

25

24

27

# **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motion to transfer venue; is overbroad as to temporal scope; and is overbroad, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterizations of "office," "place of business," "property" and "Your".

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, since January 1, 2008, Defendant has not owned or leased any property in California.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 2** 

Identify each Person (including but not limited to corporate officers or directors, owners, general managers, assistant general managers, special assistants to the general manager, pitching or hitting coordinators, directors of minor league operations, scouting directors, other coordinators and directors, roving instructors, minor league coaches or managers, area scouts, associate scouts or "bird dogs," supervisor or regional scouts, cross-checkers, or pro-coverage scouts—either advanced MLB scouts or scouts covering the minor leagues) employed or contracted by You who has (i) lived in California, (ii) worked in California, (iii) traveled to California for Your business, (iv) attended any MLB or MiLB meeting, gathering or event in California, or (v) recruited any baseball player living in California or attending High School, College or Junior College in California.

# OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad as to temporal scope; is overbroad with respect to Plaintiffs' definition of "Person", "You" and "Your"; is overbroad, vague and ambiguous with respect to the use of the term "recruited"; and goes

beyond the scope of the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue with respect to subparagraphs (iii) through (v). Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory – specifically, with respect to subparagraphs (iii) through (v) – on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, in response to subparagraphs (i) and (ii), Defendant has identified below individuals employed by Defendant by name, title, current city and state of residence and current principal work location whose duties and responsibilities include minor league baseball operations and includes individuals identified by Plaintiffs in their initial disclosures. The list of individuals identified below is not exhaustive, and Defendant expressly reserves its right to supplement or modify this list.

1	2	
1	3	

Name	Title	Principal Work Location	City/State of Residence
Albert, Rick	Hitting Coach	Lake Buena Vista, FL	FL FL
Alcantara, Ricky	Trainer	Pearl, MS	TX
Almarez, Johnny	Director of International Scouting and Operations	Atlanta, GA	TX
Bialas, David	Minor League Field Coordinator	Orlando, FL	FL
Blake, Robby	Senior Payroll Manager	Atlanta, GA	GA
Botelho, Derek	Rehab Pitching Coordinator	Orlando, FL	, IA
Breeden, Joseph	Roving Instructor - Catching	Orlando, FL	FL
Clift, Justin	Equipment Manager - Orlando	Orlando, FL	, FL
Coppolella, John	Assistant General Manager	Atlanta, GA	, GA
Craft, Dan	Strength and Conditioning Coach - PT	Orlando, FL/Danville, VA	NY
Cruz, Ivan	Hitting Coach	Danville, VA	FL

# Case 3:14-cv-00608-JCS Document 280-2 Filed 11/17/14 Page 10 of 31 CONFIDENTIAL

Name	Title	Principal Work Location	City/State of Residence
Curry, Jason	Strength and Conditioning Coach - PT	Lawrenceville, GA	PA
Damschroder, Kyle	Trainer	Rome, GA	OH
Dayton, Chris	Strength and Conditioning Coach - PT	Pearl, Mississippi	CA
DeMacio, Tony	Director of Scouting	Atlanta, GA	VA
Dubee, Richard	Pitching Coordinator	Orlando, FL	FL
Elia, Lee	Special Assistant to Player Development	Orlando, FL	, FL
Garbey, Barbaro	Coach	Lake Buena Vista, FL	MI
Gonzalez, James	Assistant Strength & Conditioning Coordinator	Orlando, FL	FL
Grabowski, Matt	Baseball Operations Assistant	Atlanta, GA	GA
Graus, Jason	Trainer	Lawrenceville, GA	GA
Hernandez, Julio	Trainer	Orlando, FL	FL
Holbert, Aaron	Manager	Pearl, MS	, CA
Ingle, Randy	Manager	Danville, VA	NC
Ingram, Garey	Batting Coach	Lawrenceville, GA	, GA
Juras, Lara	Vice President of Human Resources	Atlanta, GA	GA
Knight, Ron	Baseball Operations Assistant	Atlanta, GA	GA
Lewallyn, Dennis	Pitching Coach	Pearl, MS	, FL
Lewis, Derrick	Pitching Coach	Lynchburg, VA	NC
Lopez, Juan	Coach	Lake Buena Vista, FL	, FL
Lopez, Luis	Roving Instructor - Infield	Orlando, FL	PR

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

# CONFIDENTIAL

Name	Title	Principal Work Location	City/State of Residence	
Luat, Joseph	Trainer	Orlando, FL/Danville, VA	CA	
Luckert, Gabriel	Pitching Coach	Rome, GA	FL	
Manno, Bruce J.	Vice President and Assistant GM/Player Development	Atlanta, GA	GA	
Martinez, Jose	Special Assistant to the GM & Player Development	Orlando, FL	FL	
Martinez, Willie	Pitching Coach	Lake Buena Vista, FL	FL	
Mendez, Carlos	Hitting Coach	Lynchburg, VA	DE	
Meyer, Dan	Pitching Coach	Danville, VA	FL	
Mitchell,	Roving Instructor -	Orlando, FL	CA	
Robert	OF/Base Running			
Moore, Bobby	Batting Coach	Rome, GA	GA	
Moore, Chip	Chief Financial Officer	Atlanta, GA	GA	
Moses, John	Hitting Coach	Pearl, MS	AZ	
Mota Brito, Jose	Coach	Orlando, FL/Danville, VA	GA	
Nadell, Rick	Strength and Conditioning Coach - PT	Orlando, FL	, MA	
Nicholson, Billy	Coach	Lawrenceville, GA	GA GA	
Oceguera, Marc	Physical Therapist	Orlando, FL	CA	
Ortegon, Ronnie	Hitting Coordinator	Orlando, FL	, TX	
Perez, Nestor	Coach	Rome, GA	FL	
Reed, Marty	Pitching Coach	Lawrenceville, GA	FL	
Richardson, Ronnie	Director of Minor League Operations	Atlanta, GA	GA	
Salazar, Luis	Manager	Lynchburg, VA	FL	
Schuerholz, John	President	Atlanta, GA	GA	
Schuerholz, Jonathan	Manager	Rome, GA	GA	

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

Case 3:14-cv-00608-JCS Document 280-2 Filed 11/17/14 Page 12 of 31

CONFIDENTIAL

Name	Title	Principal Work Location	City/State of Residence
Sheeks, Ryan	Strength and Conditioning	Lynchburg, VA	, CA
	Coach - PT		
Slate, Rick	Director, Strength and Conditioning	Orlando, FL	FL
Snitker, Brian	Manager	Lawrenceville, GA	GA
Straus, Tim	Coach	Rome, GA	GA
Toenjes, Joseph	Trainer	Lynchburg, VA	FL
Wheeler, Rocket	Manager	Lake Buena Vista, FL	SC
Williams, Richard	Special Assistant to the GM -	Orlando, FL	FL
	Pitching Development		
Witkowski, Frank	Strength and Conditioning	Rome, GA	FL
Wren, Frank	Coach - PT Executive Vice President and	Atlanta, GA	GA
	General Manager		

In further response to subparagraph (i), since January 1, 2008, Defendant has not had any owners, corporate officers or directors who have maintained their principal place of residence in California. In further response to subparagraph (ii), Defendant has identified below any Club employee whose employment has been based in California since January 1, 2008.

Name	Title	Principal Work Location	Period of Time Employed in CA (During Relevant Period)
Adams, Jr., Richard	Area Scouting Supervisor	Colfax, CA	1/1/12 – Present
Battista Jr., Thomas	Regional Cross Checker	Thousand Oaks, CA	1/1/08 – 12/31/09
Clemmens, Blaine	Area Scouting Supervisor	Petaluma, CA	1/1/08 – 12/31/09
Davis, Thomas	Regional Cross Checker	Ripon, CA	11/1/09 – Present
Hunter, Brian	Area Scouting Supervisor	Lakewood, CA	1/1/08 – 12/31/11

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

Name	Title	Principal Work Location	Period of Time Employed in CA (During Relevant Period)
Leavitt, Steven	Area Scouting Supervisor	Huntington Beach, CA	11/1/09 – Present
Moore, Timothy	Area Scouting Supervisor	Elk Grove, CA	1/1/08 – 12/31/11
Spiers, Michael	Professional Scout	San Bernadino, CA	1/1/08 - 12/31/09
Wadsworth, Robert	Area Scouting Supervisor	Westminister, CA	1/1/08 – 12/31/09

In response to subparagraph (iv), and notwithstanding Defendant's specific objection that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome and not relevant to the pending motions, pursuant to Rule 33(c), Defendant refers to a document identifying the location of each formal MLB meeting that took place or was scheduled to take place since January 1, 2008. *See*Attachment #1 for Personal Jurisdiction Defendants – MLB Meetings. For purposes of Defendant's answer to this Interrogatory, upon information belief, a representative from the Defendant Club was present at each meeting referenced herein.

Defendant's answers to this Interrogatory do not constitute an acknowledgement or representation that the individuals identified have knowledge or information concerning any claims and defenses, and shall not be construed as a waiver of any objection Defendant may assert at the appropriate time, all of which are hereby expressly preserved. Defendant also reserves its rights to rely on the testimony of individuals who are not identified above, consistent with the Federal Rules, Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders.

# SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and the objections stated in Defendant's Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 and incorporating those objections herein, Defendant identifies the following individuals whose employment was not based on California as having made the following approximate number trips per year to California from 2008 through the present, for the purpose of scouting and/or recruiting amateur players:

- 1

Name	Title	Trips to California
Dick Balderson	Special Assistant to GM	5 trips/year in 2008-2012
Bill Bliss	Area Supervisor	10 or more trips/year since 2009
Brian Bridges	Southeast Cross-Checker	5-7 trips/year since 2008
Roy Clark	Director of Scouting	3-4 trips/year in 2008-2009
Tim Conroy	Special Assistant to GM	5 trips/year in 2008-2012
Tony DeMacio	Director of Scouting	3-4 trips/year since 2009
Brett Evert	Area Supervisor	10 or more trips/year since 2008
Paul Faulk	East Coast Cross-Checker	5-7 trips/year in 2008-2009
John Flannery	National Cross-Checker	5-7 trips/year since 2009
Steve Fleming	East Coast Supervisor	10 or more trips/year in 2008-2009
Jim Fregosi	Special Assistant to GM	5 trips/year in 2008-2013
Jerry Jordan	National Cross-Checker	5-7 trips/year in 2008-2009
Chris Knabenshue	Area Supervisor	10 or more trips/year since 2008
James Merriweather	Southwest Cross-Checker	5-7 trips/year since 2009
Deron Rombach	National Cross-Checker	5-7 trips/year since 2009
Jeff Schugel	Special Assistant to GM	5 trips/year in 2014
Brad Sloan	Special Assistant to GM	5 trips/year in 2013-2014
Terry R. Tripp	Midwest Cross-Checker	5-7 trips/year since 2008
Darin Vaughan	Area Supervisor	10 or more trips in 2014
Bobby Wine	Advance Scout	3-4 trips/year in 2008

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 3**

For each Person Identified in response to Interrogatory number 2(i), state:

- a. The Person's city of residence;
- b. The city in which the Person has maintained his place of business;
- c. The time period that such person lived in California while employed or contracted by You; and
- d. The Person's title and scope of responsibility.

# **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant's Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 is incorporated as if fully set forth herein. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks the individual's "scope of responsibility," which is vague and ambiguous, not relevant to the limited

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue, and is unduly burdensome. Defendant also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks the individual's city of residence and the city in which the individual has maintained a place of business, which goes beyond the scope of the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue.

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant refers Plaintiffs to its Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 2.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

3

5

6

8

# INTERROGATORY NO. 4

For each Person Identified in response to Interrogatory number 2(ii)-(v), state:

- a. The Person's city of residence;
- b. The city in which the Person has maintained his place of business;
- c. The purpose and duration of the Person's presence in California for each occasion he or she was in California; and
- d. The Person's title and scope of responsibility.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

17

#### **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant's Objections and Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 2 and 3 are incorporated as if fully set forth herein. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks the "purpose and duration of the Person's presence in California for each occasion he or she was in California" on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous, not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue, and is unduly burdensome.

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing

General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant refers Plaintiffs to its Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 2.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and the objections stated in Defendant's Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 4 and incorporating those objections herein, Defendant refers Plaintiffs to its Supplemental Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No.

2.

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 5**

For each year between 2008 and the present, state the number of California residents drafted by You or signed to a Minor League Uniform Player Contract by You.

#### **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad as to temporal scope, the characterization of "You" and the request for the number of California residents "signed to a Minor League Uniform Player Contract" which is not limited to putative class members; is vague and ambiguous as to the characterization of "California residents"; is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue because, *inter alia*, the contacts of the named plaintiffs, rather than the absent putative class members, are determinative on such motions and that information is equally available to Plaintiffs; and is unduly burdensome.

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant has identified below the number of individuals selected in the Rule 4 Amateur Draft each year since 2008 by the state in which their high school or college was located at the time of the draft.

1								
	State/Territory	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
2	Alabama	4	2	3	1	1	3	2
3	Arizona	1	2	0	2	0	1	1
٠ 	Arkansas	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
4	California	4	7	9	5	3	7	4
	Colorado	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
5	Connecticut	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
_	Florida	2	5	2	2	6	4	3
6	Georgia	10	7	1	1	6	4	3
7	Hawaii	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
′∥	Idaho	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
8	Illinois	1	2	2	3	0	0	2
	Indiana	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
9	Iowa	0	0	1	0	0	10	0
_	Kansas	1	0	$\frac{1}{1}$	1	0	0	1
$0 \parallel$	Kentucky	1	0	0	6	0	0	10
1	Louisiana	0	$\frac{1}{1}$	0	0	0	0	0
┸	Maryland	0	$\frac{1}{1}$	$\frac{1}{0}$	1	$\frac{1}{0}$	$\frac{0}{0}$	$\frac{1}{1}$
$_{2}\Vert$	Massachusetts	0	10	0	1	$\frac{1}{0}$	0	$\frac{1}{0}$
-	Michigan	0	0	$\frac{1}{0}$	0	0	$\frac{3}{3}$	$\frac{0}{1}$
3	Minnesota	1	0	$\frac{1}{1}$	1	$\frac{1}{0}$	$\frac{3}{1}$	$\frac{1}{0}$
- []	Mississippi	0	0	$\frac{1}{1}$	0	$\frac{1}{0}$	1	$\frac{1}{1}$
4	Missouri	0	1	0	1	5	1	2
_	Montana	0	0	$\frac{0}{0}$	$\frac{1}{0}$	1	0	$\frac{2}{0}$
5	Nebraska	0	$\frac{0}{0}$	0	0	0	0	2
6	Nevada	4	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	$\frac{2}{0}$
Ŭ∥	1	0	$\frac{10}{3}$	$\frac{2}{0}$	0	0	0	0
7	New Jersey New Mexico	1	$\frac{3}{0}$			1	0	0
	[	l	1	1 2	0	4		
8	New York	0	0	3	1		1	1
الم	North Carolina	4	3	1	1	3	1	3
9	Ohio	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
$_{0}\ $	Oklahoma	0	0	1	2	0	1	2
۱۱ ۲	Oregon	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
$_{1}\ $	Pennsylvania	0	0	3	$\frac{1}{1}$	0	1	0
Ш	Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	South Carolina	4	5	2	3	2	1	1
	Tennessee	5	6	0	6	1	2	0
3	Texas	5	1	6	5	4	4	3
4	Utah	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
<b>→</b>	Virginia	1	2	4	1	0	1	1
5	Washington	1	0	0	1	2	1	0
_	West Virginia	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
6	Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
7	Totals	51	49	51	50	40	40	40

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

CONFIDENTIAL

1

2

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 6**

3

For each year between 2008 and the present, state the number of minor leaguers employed by You who maintained an off-season address in California.

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections

herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad as to

characterization of "off-season address"; is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection

with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer

venue because, inter alia, the contacts of the named plaintiffs, rather than the absent putative class

members, are determinative on such motions and that information is equally available to Plaintiffs;

temporal scope and the characterization of "You"; is vague and ambiguous as to the

5

6

7

# OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 7**

and is unduly burdensome.

For each year between 2008 and the present, identify each off-season workout, conditioning or training packet, contract addenda (including an "Addendum C"), or any other communication relating to their employment You sent to minor leaguers identified in interrogatory number 6.

20

21

#### OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7

28

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad as to temporal scope and the characterization of "You"; is vague, ambiguous and unduly burdensome as to the characterization of "off-season workout, conditioning or training packet...or any other communication relating to their employment"; is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

transfer venue because, *inter alia*, the contacts of the named plaintiffs, rather than the absent putative class members, are determinative on such motions and that information is equally available to Plaintiffs; is unduly burdensome; and is premature to the extent it seeks information pertaining to the merits of this action.

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant answers as follows: Since 2008, minor league players have been provided their workout programs at each affiliate location prior to the end of the season.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and the objections stated in Defendant's Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 7 and incorporating those objections herein, Defendant has no responsive communications that were mailed to Named Plaintiff Matt Frevert.

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 8**

For each year between 2008 and the present, identify the number of minor leaguers that signed a Uniform Player Contract, any subsequent contract addenda (including "Addendum C"), or employment contract in California.

#### **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue because, *inter alia*, the location of contract execution has no bearing on whether the Court can exercise personal jurisdiction over Defendant. Defendant also objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome with respect to

temporal scope; is overbroad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "minor leaguers" and "employment contract"; and is unduly burdensome to the extent that Defendant does not maintain records that indicate where the UPCs and/or Addenda Cs were executed.

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant does not have a formal policy or practice with respect to the location of where minor league players sign their Uniform Player Contracts and/or Addenda Cs.

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 9**

Identify the date and location of each tryout You held in California, (Major League Rule 3(g)), and state:

- a. The overall number of Persons (including those trying out) who attended;
- b. The number of California residents who attended, and the number from each other state as needed;
- c. The name and residence of the person who attended on Your behalf.

# OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue because, *inter alia*, whether Defendant conducts "tryouts" in California with individuals who have not yet provided services for Defendant pursuant to a Uniform Player Contract has no bearing on whether the Court can exercise personal jurisdiction over Defendant in California and/or whether the Middle District of Florida is the more convenient forum than the Northern District of California. Defendant also objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome with respect to temporal scope and the

characterization of "You," "Your" and "Persons"; is overbroad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "tryout," "California residents" and "Your behalf"; and is unduly burdensome. Defendant objects on the grounds that it is unable to verify whether an individual who participated in a tryout, pursuant to Major League Rule 3(g), is a "California resident."

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant answers as follows: Since January 1, 2008, Defendant has held an average of 16 tryouts per year, and no more than 24 in a given year pursuant to Major League Rule 3(g). The tryouts have been held in various states throughout the country, and only one of the 111 tryouts since January 1, 2008 was held in California.

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 10**

Identify any revenue You have generated based on any activity occurring in California, whether the activity was performed by You or not, including revenue from licensing, merchandising, televised baseball games, ticket sales, the Base Plan (Article XXIV of the Basic Agreement), the Revenue Sharing Plan (Article XXIV of the Basic Agreement), the Supplemental Plan (Article XXIV of the Basic Agreement), the Commissioner's Discretionary Fund (Article XXIV of the Basic Agreement), Major League Baseball Properties, Inc., or Major League Baseball Advanced Media, and state:

- a. The amount of the revenue by Revenue Sharing Year or calendar year;
- b. The source of the revenue by Revenue Sharing Year or calendar year.

# **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to

ase 3:14-cv-00608-JCS	Document 280-2	Filed 11/17/14	Page 22 of 31
			CONFIDENTIAL

dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue because, *inter alia*, revenue generated based on *any* activity in California, regardless of whether such activity was performed by Defendant, has no bearing on whether the Court may exercise personal jurisdiction over Defendant and/or whether the Middle District of Florida is a more convenient forum than the Northern District of California. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the request seeks proprietary and highly confidential financial information; is overbroad and unduly burdensome with respect to temporal scope; and is overbroad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "revenue," "any activity" and "You".

#### SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and the objections stated in Defendant's Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 10 and incorporating those objections herein, Defendant refers Plaintiffs to Defendant The Office of the Commissioner of Baseball's Supplemental Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 5.

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 11**

Identify each of Your employees for whom You have paid payroll taxes to the state of California due to work performed on Your behalf.

#### **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory seeks proprietary and confidential financial information; is overbroad with respect to temporal scope; and is overbroad, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "work," "employees," "You" and "Your".

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing

General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant has

paid payroll taxes to the state of California due to work performed on its behalf there for the

following number of people (excluding Major League Players and Major League coaching staff)

each year:

- 2008: 5 employees out of more than 2,000 total employees
- 2009: 7 employees out of more than 2,000 total employees
- 2010: 3 employees out of more than 2,000 total employees
- 2011: 3 employees out of more than 2,000 total employees
- 2012: 3 employees out of more than 2,000 total employees
- 2013: 3 employees out of more than 2,000 total employees

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 12**

Identify the amount of any taxes, including but not limited to income taxes, corporate, partnership or LLC taxes, local taxes, franchise taxes, licensing fees, franchise fees, fines, penalties, unemployment insurance, employment training tax, or state disability insurance You have paid to the state of California or any agency of the state of California.

18 ||

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

#### **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue. Defendant also objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory seeks proprietary and confidential financial information; is overbroad with respect to temporal scope and its characterization of "taxes"; and is overbroad, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "You" and "Your".

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing

28

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

surrounding such action, has no bearing on whether Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the Court's forum sufficient for the Court to exercise personal jurisdiction over it. In addition, this Interrogatory has no relevance with regard to the pending motion to transfer venue. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad in its entirety; and is specifically overbroad, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "You" and "Your".

#### SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and the objections stated in Defendant's Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 13 and incorporating those Objections herein, from 2008 to the present, Defendant has not filed any lawsuits, cross-claims or counterclaims in California.

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 14**

Identify each possible witness who you contend will be inconvenienced by a trial of this case in the Northern District of California, the reason each will be inconvenienced, and the Person's city of residence and city of principal place of business.

#### **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant's Objections and Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 2 through 4 are incorporated as if fully set forth herein. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad with respect to Plaintiffs' definition of "Person"; and is overbroad and unduly burdensome with regard to the request that Defendant provides specific reasons for its answers. Defendant also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that Plaintiffs seek premature witness identification.

Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, Defendant refers Plaintiffs to its Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 2.

Defendant's answers to this Interrogatory do not constitute an acknowledgement or representation that the individuals identified have knowledge or information concerning any claims and defenses, and shall not be construed as a waiver of any objection Defendant may assert at the appropriate time, all of which are hereby expressly preserved. Defendant also reserves its rights to rely on the testimony of individuals who are not identified in response to Defendant's Objection and Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, consistent with the Federal Rules, Local Civil Rules, the Court's individual rules and/or standing orders.

# **INTERROGATORY NO. 15**

Identify each first year player that You permitted to alter or change his Uniform Player Contract (other than the information provided in the addenda, such as personal information of the draftee, the signing bonus, if any, and college scholarship plan, if any).

# **OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15**

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue because, *inter alia*, Plaintiffs' contention in this Interrogatory has no bearing on whether the Court may exercise personal jurisdiction over Defendant and/or whether the Middle District of Florida is the more convenient forum than the Northern District of California. Defendant further objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory seeks information pertaining to the merits of this action and is premature; is argumentative; and is an inappropriate contention interrogatory. Defendant also objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad and unduly burdensome, in particular with respect to temporal scope; and is overbroad,

C	ase 3:14-cv-00608-JCS Document 280-2 Filed 11/17/14 Page 27 of 31
	CONFIDENTIAL
1	unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "You" and "alter
2	or change."
3	
4	INTERROGATORY NO. 16
5	Have You ever been qualified, licensed or registered to do business in California? If yes, identify
6	the years in which You were registered to do business in California and the reason You terminated
7	the registration or otherwise failed to continue to be registered to do business in California.
8	
9	OBJECTION AND ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16
10	Subject to and without waiving the General Objections and incorporating those Objections
11	herein, Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome
12	and not relevant to the limited discovery in connection with opposing the pending motions to
13	dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and to transfer venue. Defendant further objects on the
14	grounds that the Interrogatory is overbroad with respect to temporal scope; and is overbroad,
15	unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous with respect to the characterization of "You" and
16	Plaintiffs' request for the "reason", if any, the California business was terminated.
17	Notwithstanding these objections and subject to and without waiving the foregoing
18	General and Specific Objections, and in accordance with the Court's June 27 Order, since January
19	1, 2008, Defendant has not been qualified, licensed or registered to do business in the state of
20	California.
21	
22	
23	

CONFIDENTIAL 1 Dated: October 23, 2014 Respectfully submitted, 2 /s/ Elise M. Bloom 3 Elise M. Bloom (pro hac vice) Howard L. Ganz 4 Neil H. Abramson (pro hac vice) Adam M. Lupion (pro hac vice) 5 PROSKAUËR ROSE LLP 11 Times Square 6 New York, NY 10036 Telephone: (212) 969-3000 7 Facsimile: (212) 969-2900 8 Laura Reathaford (SBN 254751) PROSKAUER ROSE LLP 9 2049 Century Park East, 32nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206 10 Telephone: (310) 557-2900 Facsimile: (310) 557-2193 11 lreathaford@proskauer.com 12 Attorneys for Defendant 13 14 TO: KOREIN TILLERY, LLC 15 Stephen M. Tillery Garrett R. Broshuis 16 Guiseppe S. Giardina 505 North 7th Street, Suite 3600 17 St. Louis, MO 63101 18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 26
DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE – CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS 28

С	ase 3:14-cv-00608-JCS Document 280-2 Filed 11/17/14 Page 29 of 31 CONFIDENTIAL
	<u>VERIFICATION</u>
1	
2	STATE OF Georgia
3	COUNTY OF TUHON; SS.:
5	STATE OF Georgia: SS.:  COUNTY OF FULTON: SS.:  I. Greg Heller being duly sworn, state that I am the SVP: General County at
6	Defendant Atlanta National League Baseball Club, Inc. and hereby verify under oath that I have
7	read the Defendant Atlanta National League Baseball Club, Inc.'s Second Supplemental
8	Objections and Answers to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories to Personal Jurisdiction
9	Defendants Regarding Personal Jurisdiction and Venue and know the contents thereof. I am
10	making this verification based on my personal knowledge, knowledge or information provided to
11	me by other employees or agents of Defendant and/or gained from Defendant's records, except as
12	to the matters stated to be alleged on information and belief; and as to those matters I believe them
13	to be true.
14	
15	
16	Dig Helle
17	
18	Sworn to before me this 23 day of October 2014
19	e approximation
20	Notary Public
21	EXPIRES  GEORGIA  OCT. 22, 2016  ON COUNTRICK  ON COUNTRIC
22	EXPLOTA PARTIE TO TAR PROPERTY OF THE STATE
23	GEORGIA OCT. 22, 2016
24	Thomas BLIC with the state of t
25	WINDON COOKING

Case 3:14-cv-00608-JCS Document 280-2 Filed 11/17/14 Page 30 of 31 CONFIDENTIAL PROSKAUER ROSE LLP 1 Elise M. Bloom (pro hac vice) Howard L. Ganz 2 Neil H. Abramson (pro hac vice) Adam M. Lupion (pro hac vice) 3 11 Times Square New York, NY 10036 Telephone: (212) 969-3000 (212) 969-2900 Facsimile: 5 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP Laura Reathaford (SBN 254751) lreathaford@proskauer.com 2049 Century Park East, 32nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206 310.557.2900 Telephone: Facsimile: 310.557.2193 10 Attorneys for Defendant 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 13 AARON SENNE, et al., Individually and on CASE NO. 3:14-cv-00608-RS 14 Behalf of All Those Similarly Situated; **CLASS ACTION** 15 Plaintiffs, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 16 vs. 17 OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF BASEBALL, an unincorporated association 18 doing business as MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL; et al.; 19 Defendants. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB, INC.'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS

C	ase 3:14-cv-00608-JCS Document 280-2 Filed 11/17/14 Page 31 of 31 CONFIDENTIAL
1	I hereby certify that on October 23, 2014, I caused to be served the following:
3	Defendant Atlanta National League Baseball Club, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Objections and Answers to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories to Personal Jurisdiction Defendants Regarding Personal Jurisdiction and Venue
5	by e-mail on the following counsel for Plaintiffs:
6 7	Garrett R. Broshuis, Esq. Giuseppe S. Giardina, Esq. KOREIN TILLERY, LLC 505 North 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3600 St. Louis, MO 63101
8	Bobby Pouya
9	Daniel L. Warshaw PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP
10	15165 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 400 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
12	
13	Dated: New York, New York
14	October 23, 2014  Respectfully submitted,
15	
16	<u>/s/ Elise M. Bloom</u> PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
ا 17	Elise M. Bloom Eleven Times Square
18	New York, New York 10036 Ph.: (212) 969.3410
19	Fax: (212) 969.2900
20	ebloom@proskauer.com
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	DEFENDANT ATLANTA NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB. INC.'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00608-RS